

ation the indirect effects of the racetrack (e.g., noise, pollution, traffic) in addition to the direct effect of filling in and thereby destroying wetlands; and second, that the agency needed to take into account the impact of the racetrack on the entire battlefield, not just the isolated area of wetlands. The case never went to court. The racetrack developer's financing collapsed and plans for the racetrack were scratched, making the case moot. The land reverted to the first developer.

The Foundation renewed its efforts to acquire the land. Relying again on the generous financial backing of the APCWS, the Foundation succeeded in striking a deal with the original developer and interested contiguous neighbors to purchase 800 acres of the industrially zoned land and an additional 700 acres of contiguous agricultural land. The sale was finalized in April 1997, preserving the most significant portion of the battlefield for generations to come.

The key to the Foundation's ultimate success has been its willingness and ability to participate aggressively in every public decision-making forum. While the Foundation obviously did not succeed in winning sympathetic decisions from the county, the court, or the Army Corps of Engineers, its efforts in each of those arenas allowed for ever-increasing public attention that built the case for preservation of a significant and threatened resource. When the chance to preserve the battlefield through acquisition finally arose, Brandy

Station had become a cause that could and did attract the funds to make the purchase possible.

Notes

- ¹ The Board allowed representatives from the Foundation only three minutes to present the historic significance of the Civil War battlefield. The Foundation had assembled a team of experts: financial people, representatives from the transportation industry, and historians. All were excluded from presenting a reasonable case for the preservation of an important historic site. This exclusion provided the Foundation with grounds to launch a lawsuit.
- ² The three separate parcels cited in the unilateral Determination of Eligibility met National Register criteria A, B, and D.
- ³ The other 1,000 acres remained zoned for industrial use.
- ⁴ The Army Corps of Engineers had authority to issue the permit under §404 of the Clean Water Act, 33 U.S.C. §1344(e).

Tersh Boasberg is an attorney in private practice in Washington, DC. He specializes in historic preservation and land use law. He has represented the Save the [Manassas] Battlefield Coalition and other Civil War groups in addition to the Brandy Station Foundation. He is a former chairman of the DC Zoning Commission and now chairs the Committee of 100 on the Federal City.

Charles A. Birnbaum

Treatments for Historic Battlefield Landscapes

The physical manifestation of cultural history is a complex layering of things associated with people and events. Consider, for example, the Piper Farm at Antietam National Battlefield. The farm complex has a high level of integrity for its turn-of-the-century development. Therefore, if the decision is made to "restore" this landscape to the Civil War period, the result may be the removal of this farm complex and consequent loss of significant history. Interpreting the multiple layers of a landscape's continuum is a more honest cultural landscape preservation approach.

Careful planning prior to treatment can help prevent irrevocable damage to a historic battlefield

landscape through a misguided treatment decision. Professional techniques for identifying, documenting, and treating cultural landscapes have advanced over the past 25 years and are continually being refined. As described in the National Park Service publication *Preservation Brief #36: Protecting Cultural Landscapes*, the preservation planning process for cultural landscapes, including historic battlefields, should involve historical research; inventory and documentation of existing conditions; site analysis and evaluation of integrity and significance; development of a cultural landscape preservation approach and treatment plan; development of a cultural landscape management plan and management philosophy;

development of a strategy for ongoing maintenance; preparation of a record of treatment (e.g., preservation, rehabilitation, restoration, and reconstruction); and future research recommendations.

When battlefield landscapes are restored, the goal is to make the landscape appear as it did at a particular significant time in its history, rather than to maintain and preserve the landscape as it has evolved over time. As opposed to preservation and rehabilitation treatments, restoration may include removal of features from other periods and replacing missing features from the target period. Documentation and physical evidence should substantiate this work, and conjecture should be avoided. For example, fences should not be introduced just because they are “of the period.” Historic fence locations should be identified by archeology. Their design and construction should be confirmed by historical documentation (visual records such as photographs and stereoscopic views are ideal). Additionally, combining features that never existed together historically can create a false sense of history (i.e., by “restoring” the battlefield landscape complete with contemporary memorials and a modern visitors center).

To assist in this decision-making process, the National Park Service recently published *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for the Treatment of Cultural Landscapes*. The 150-page, richly illustrated document emphasizes that not only should conjecture be avoided, but that the following general recommendations and comments apply to cultural landscapes, including historic battlefields.

Research the battlefield landscape before undertaking project work. Research findings help identify a battlefield landscape's historic period(s) of ownership, occupancy, and development, and bring greater understanding of the associations that make them significant. Research findings also provide a foundation to make educated decisions for project treatment, and can guide management, maintenance, and interpretation. In addition, research findings may be useful in satisfying compliance reviews, especially Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended.

Document the landscape as it exists at the present time to provide a baseline from which to operate. All component landscapes (e.g., a farmstead contained within a broader battlefield landscape) and individual features (e.g., fences, earthworks, memorials, roads, buildings, etc.) that contribute to the land-

scape's historic character should be recorded. The level of documentation needed depends on the nature and significance of the battlefield resource.

Consider a battlefield landscape as a continuum through history. This is critical in order to evaluate the landscape's cultural and historic value. Analysis helps clarify the landscape's change over time, breaking it down into chronological and physical “layers.” Individual features can be identified with a discrete period of introduction, or their presence or absence confirmed to a certain date, thereby assisting in the evaluation of the landscape's significance and integrity. In addition, analysis allows a battlefield to be viewed within the context of other cultural landscapes and influences treatment decisions. For example, roads introduced into Civil War battlefield landscapes in the early 20th century were laid out in the picturesque style. Such roads, derived from the design of public parks of that era, may be character-defining features as significant as the battle event.

Character-defining features that convey a battlefield's significance in history must be present and must possess historic integrity. Location, setting, design, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association should be considered in determining whether a landscape and its character-defining features possess historic integrity.

Preservation planning for cultural landscapes involves a broad array of dynamic variables. Adopting comprehensive treatment and management plans, in concert with a preservation maintenance strategy, acknowledges a cultural landscape's ever-changing nature and the interrelationship of treatment, management, and maintenance.

Charles A. Birnbaum, FASLA, is the Coordinator of the Historic Landscape Initiative, Heritage Preservation Services, National Park Service, Washington, DC, and is the editor of the Guidelines for the Treatment of Cultural Landscapes.

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for the Treatment of Cultural Landscapes is available from the Government Printing Office. The GPO stock number is 024-005-01171-4. The price is \$16.00. This can be ordered by calling (703) 487-4650.